

(Re: Patent application 10/759,090)

In USPN 4964593, by Kranz, from Figure 5 it can be seen that the rotation one fin causes the rotation another fin in the opposite direction. When electric motors 9 and 10 are stationary, the fins are locked in place due to the gearing by which they are supported on the rotating tube. Looking at Figure 5, which shows how the fins are connected to the rotating tube, it can be seen that if only one motor is rotated, both fins would have to rotate in opposite directions due to the geared connection of the fins to the rotating tube. If both motors 9 and 10 are rotated in the same direction, the fins would remain in a fixed position relative to one another, while the tube is rotated by the motors. If both motors are rotated in opposite directions, the fins would rotate in opposite directions relative to one another. In his narrative in the specification, Kranz does not make any reference to rotating the fins in the same direction.

In JP 406026799A, by Watanabe, Figure 2 shows the mechanism used by Watanabe to rotate the fins. Each fin is referred to as number 11, as is also the case in Figure 4. In Figure 2, stem 23 on the nearest fin is above that fin, while stem 23 attached to the fin on the other side is below the fin. As such, if the stem 23 on the nearest fin is pushed in a rear direction relative to the missile, the fin would be rotated in a downward direction, while the fin on the other side would be rotated in an upward direction, that is, an opposite direction.

I would appreciate it if you would withdraw your rejection of claims 1-30, after considering the above discussion.

Yours sincerely,



T. Kusic.

3/3